Bruce A. Salzburg Attorney General

John W. Renneisen Deputy Attorney General

Christine Cox Senior Assistant Attorney General Herschler Building, First Floor West Cheyenne, WY 82002 (307) 777-7250 (307) 777-8920 facsimile

Attorneys for Perry Rockvam, Scott Steward and Torin Chambers in their Individual Capacities.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, FOR THE DISTRICT OF WYOMING

RUDOLF DEHAAN,)
)
Plaintiff,)
vs.) Case No. 07-CV-257-
)
PERRY ROCKVAM, et al.)
)
Defendants.)

ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES OF CHIEF PERRY ROCKVAM, SHERIFF SCOTT STEWARD IN THEIR INDIVIDUAL CAPACITIES

COMES NOW, Defendants Chief Perry Rockvam and Sheriff Scott Steward, for state law claims and in their individual capacities for federal law claims, by and through the Office of the Attorney General of the State of Wyoming, and for their Answer and Affirmative Defenses state as follows:

Case 2:07-cv-00257-ABJ Document 4 Filed 11/30/07 Page 2 of 11

ANSWER

Facts Common to All Causes of Action and Jurisdiction

- 1. Defendants are without sufficient information upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the matters contained in Paragraph 1 of Plaintiff's Complaint and therefore deny the same.
- Defendants admit the allegations contained in Paragraphs 2 and 3 of Plaintiff's
 Complaint.
- 3. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraphs 4, 5, and 6 of Plaintiff's Complaint.
- 4. Defendants admit that a Governmental Claim was served on the Defendants and attached to the Complaint as alleged in Paragraphs 7, 8, 9, and 10 of Plaintiff's Complaint. Defendants deny that the original returns were attached, that the returns were signed by the Defendants, and that this Court has jurisdiction over any state law claims by virtue of said Governmental Claim.
- 5. Defendants are without sufficient information upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the matters contained in Paragraph 11 of Plaintiff's Complaint and therefore deny the same.

Case 2:07-cv-00257-ABJ Document 4 Filed 11/30/07 Page 3 of 11

6. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraphs 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and

17 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

7. Defendants admit that Plaintiff was held in the Park County Detention Center

but deny every other allegation contained in Paragraph 18 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

8. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 19 of Plaintiff's

Complaint.

9. Defendants admit that Plaintiff was transferred to Big Horn County Detention

Center but are without sufficient information upon which to form a belief as to the truth of

the remaining matters contained in Paragraph 20 of Plaintiff's Complaint and therefore deny

the same.

10. Defendants are without sufficient information upon which to form a belief as

to the truth of the matters contained in Paragraphs 21 and 22 of Plaintiff's Complaint and

therefore deny the same.

Count I: Fourth Amendment Violation for use of Excessive Force – 42 U.S.C. § 1983

11. In response to Paragraphs 1 of Count I of Plaintiff's Complaint, Defendants

incorporate and reallege their foregoing responses to Plaintiff's Complaint.

12. In response to Paragraphs 2, 3, 4, and 5 of Plaintiff's Complaint, the

Defendants assert the allegations contained therein are not directed to them and do not

require an answer. To the extent a response is required, the Defendants deny all allegations implied or asserted therein.

<u>Count II: Fourth Amendment Violation for use of Excessive Force – Supervisory Liability – Cody Police Department – 42 U.S.C.</u> § 1983

- 13. In response to Paragraph 1 of Count II of Plaintiff's Complaint, Defendants incorporate and reallege their foregoing responses to Plaintiff's Complaint.
- 14. Defendants admit that Chief Perry Rockvam was the Chief of Police and therefore, director of the department, but deny each and every other allegation contained in Paragraph 2 of Claim II of Plaintiff's Complaint.
- 15. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of Count II of Plaintiff's Complaint.

Cruel and Unusual Punishment – 42 U.S.C. § 1983

- 16. In response to Paragraph 1 of Count III of Plaintiff's Complaint, Defendants incorporate and reallege their foregoing responses to Plaintiff's Complaint.
- 17. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 2 of Count III of Plaintiff's Complaint.

Case 2:07-cv-00257-ABJ Document 4 Filed 11/30/07 Page 5 of 11

18. Defendants admit that Plaintiff was housed in the Park County Detention

Center but deny that Plaintiff requested and was denied medical treatment as alleged in

Paragraph 3 of County III of Plaintiff's Complaint.

19. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 4 of Count III of

Plaintiff's Complaint.

20. The allegations contained in Paragraph 5 of Count III of Plaintiff's Complaint

call for a legal conclusion. To the extent that the allegations require an answer, Defendants

deny Paragraph 5 of Count III of Plaintiff's Complaint.

21. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraphs 6 and 7 of Count III

of Plaintiff's Complaint.

Count IV: Eighth Amendment Violation Cruel and Unusual Punishment – Supervisory

Liability – Park County Sheriff's Department and Detention Center – 42 U.S.C. § 1983

22. In response to Paragraph 1 of Count IV of Plaintiff's Complaint, Defendants

incorporate and reallege their foregoing responses to Plaintiff's Complaint.

23. The allegations contained in Paragraph 2 of Count IV of Plaintiff's Complaint

call for a legal conclusion. To the extent that the allegations require an answer, Defendants

deny Paragraph 2 of Count IV of Plaintiff's Complaint.

24. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of

Count IV of Plaintiff's Complaint.

Count V: State Law – Negligence and Negligent Hiring

- 25. In response to Paragraph 1 of Count V of Plaintiff's Complaint, Defendants incorporate and reallege their foregoing responses to Plaintiff's Complaint.
- 26. The allegations contained in Paragraph 2 of Count V of Plaintiff's Complaint call for a legal conclusion. To the extent that the allegations require an answer, Defendants deny Paragraph 2 of Count V of Plaintiff's Complaint.
- 27. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraphs 3, 4, and 5 of CountV of Plaintiff's Complaint.

Count VI: Battery

- 28. In response to Paragraph 1 of Count VI of Plaintiff's Complaint, Defendants incorporate and reallege their foregoing responses to Plaintiff's Complaint.
- 29. In response to Paragraphs 2, 3, and 4, including all subparts, of Plaintiff's Complaint, the Defendants assert the allegations contained therein are not directed to them and do not require an answer. To the extent a response is required, the Defendants deny all allegations implied or asserted therein.

Count VII: Attorney's Fees Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988

30. In response to Paragraph 1 of Count VII of Plaintiff's Complaint, Defendants incorporate and reallege their foregoing responses to Plaintiff's Complaint.

31. Defendants admit that Plaintiff has most likely incurred attorney's fees but deny each and every other allegation contained in Paragraph 2 of County VII of Plaintiff's

deny each and every other allegation contained in Paragraph 2 of County vii of Plaintill s

Complaint.

32. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 3 of Count VII of

Plaintiff's Complaint.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

1. Defendant Steward was not personally involved, did not acquiesce, or have any

knowledge of the events surrounding the alleged injury.

2. Defendant Chambers was not personally involved, did not acquiesce, or have

any knowledge of the events surrounding the alleged injury.

3. There is no affirmative link between any act or omission by the Defendants and

the alleged injury to the Plaintiff.

4. Plaintiff's injuries, if any, were proximately caused by the Plaintiff or third

parties whose fault is greater than the Defendants, if any.

5. All actions taken by the Defendants were privileged and authorized by law.

6. Plaintiff's conduct was such as to bar or reduce his damages.

7. Defendants are immune from suit under the Eleventh Amendment to the United

States Constitution.

8. Defendants are entitled to qualified immunity and/or "good faith" qualified immunity.

9. Respondeat superior is not an adequate basis for liability for a claim brought under 42 U.S.C. §1983.

10. Plaintiff has failed to mitigate his damages.

11. Plaintiff's Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

12. This Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over one or more of Plaintiff's claims.

13. Defendants are immune from suit over one or more of Plaintiff's claims under the Wyoming Governmental Claims Act.

14. This Court lacks jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims.

15. Defendants' actions met the applicable standard of care and they used only necessary and reasonable force.

16. Defendants were privileged and authorized by law to act as they did.

17. Defendants' acts were reasonably necessary to protect the public good.

18. Under the circumstances of this case, the acts of Defendants were objectively reasonable.

19. Plaintiff's claims are frivolous.

Case 2:07-cv-00257-ABJ Document 4 Filed 11/30/07 Page 9 of 11

20. Defendants alleges that they acted in good faith at all times and therefore are

immune from suit.

21. One or more of Plaintiff's claims are barred by the applicable statute of

limitations.

22. The Defendants assert that Plaintiff's conduct constitutes more than fifty (50)

percent of the total fault when compared to the actions of all actors, and, thus, constitutes a

bar to any recovery.

23. The Defendants allege that Plaintiff is comparatively responsible for the

injuries and damages allegedly sustained so that damages if any recoverable shall be either

precluded or diminished in proportion to the amount of comparative responsibility

attributable to Plaintiff.

24. The Defendants allege that if liability is assessed in any respect then the fault

of all parties joined and unjoined including that of the Plaintiff must be evaluated, and

liability apportioned among all persons and entities proportionate to their prospective fault.

25. The Defendants allege that any acts or omissions on their part were not the

proximate cause of the events, injuries and damages described in the Complaint.

26. The Defendants allege that if Plaintiff was injured and damaged as alleged,

such injuries and damage were solely and proximately caused by the superseding and

Case 2:07-cv-00257-ABJ Document 4 Filed 11/30/07 Page 10 of 11

intervening acts of negligence or conduct by other third persons, parties, firms, entities or

corporations over whom the Defendants had no control or right of control, and from whom

the Defendants are not legally responsible.

27. The Defendants allege that the Plaintiff has failed to mitigate his alleged

damages, if any, as required by law.

28. The Defendants allege that the Plaintiff invited and aggravated the alleged

injuries.

29. The Defendants deny that any act or omission on their part caused the harm

alleged by Plaintiff.

30. The Defendants assert that Plaintiff has failed to exhaust his administrative

remedies and is thereby barred from asserting his claims or causes of action.

31. Defendants reserve the right to assert additional affirmative defenses, as they

become known.

WHEREFORE, Defendants prays that Plaintiff take nothing by virtue of his

Complaint filed herein, for their costs and for such other and further relief as the Court deems

proper.

Deehan v. Rockvam, et al., Case No. 07-CV-257-J Answer and Affirmative Defenses Rockvam and Steward Page 10 of 11 DATED this 30th day of November, 2007.

/s/

Christine Cox Senior Assistant Attorney General

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 30th day of November, 2007, the foregoing was electronically filed and served upon the following individuals:

Nicholas H. Carter Stephanie M. Humphrey The Nick Carter Law Firm, P.C. P O Box 909 Gillette, WY 82717-0909

/S/

Christine Cox Senior Assistant Attorney General